

MEETING NOTES

Traffic Advisory Board Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee

Special Meeting: On-Street Pedestrian Focus Group

3:30 p.m., March 27, 2012

Traffic Management Center, 1107 W. Chestnut Expressway

TAB Members Present: Committee Chair Valerie Sharlin, Bob Jones

Others Present: Mary Christiano (Pedestrian Focus Group Facilitator), Matt Boehner, Mike Chiles, Michael Cook, Rinda Dunn, Dianne Gallion, Joel Keller, Natasha Longpine, Dennis McMan, Curtis Owen, Andrew Seiler, Terry Whaley, Cari Ann Wright

Traffic Engineering Staff: Mandy Buettgen, Dawne Gardner, David Hutchison

- I. **Call to order:** Meeting was called to order at 3:31 by Chair Valerie Sharlin, who turned chair of the meeting to Mary Christiano, On-Street Pedestrian Focus Group Facilitator.
- II. **Discuss Prioritization Process for On-Street Pedestrian Facilities:** David referenced the comments received at the February 7 Workshop and the February 28 Public meeting (for which meeting notes are available) as the basis for the outline presented today. The enhanced meeting agenda is listed in the order of importance from rankings and contains the comments made at the February 7 meeting. The purpose of today's meeting is to review and refine the concerns listed herein.
 - a. **Major Streets** – Many major streets are bus routes and are being prioritized for pedestrian improvements related to bus access. Report will identify need to include all major streets for pedestrian improvement priority.
 - i. David stated that sidewalks typically have a 50-year life, but repairs are required periodically for subsurface and surface failure and faults due to tree roots, etc.
 - ii. David reviewed the history of sidewalk construction. Sidewalks have been constructed in the City as streets and subdivisions have been built since the 1860's. However, subdivisions built outside the City were built without regulation until two or three decades ago and were often built with an inadequate street and no sidewalks. The pre-existing farm roads became the major streets with little or no improvement. When these subdivisions were annexed, the City inherited a substandard system that is slowly being brought up to standard. So we have a central city with originally good facilities that are more than 50 years old and need to be reconstructed; recent development with good facilities; and, in between, a doughnut of subdivisions built outside the City prior to 1980 that do not have adequate facilities for walking or bicycling.
 - b. **School Routes** – PWTE staff solicits requests from school administrators and PTA's for walking route improvements. School walking route improvements are funded by a \$800,000 (\$270,000 per year) ¼ Cent CIP Sales Tax program resulting in construction of approximately three miles per year.
 - i. Mandy discussed the current process including a request form for three ¼ mile segments sent to each elementary school to be completed by administration and

PTA; a staff review to determine feasibility, cost, and priority; development of construction contracts.

ii. Programs for encouraging children to walk

- 1.** Walking school bus – Downtown Family Y has a grant for five walking school bus programs in Springfield. We discussed that [PedNet](#) in Columbia and [TrailNet](#) in St. Louis have extensive programs working with people for healthy living and safety including education walking school bus. A city wide walking school bus program is labor intensive requiring a dedicated coordinator and volunteers in each school.
- 2.** Off-street trails and connectors to schools provide opportunities to walk without encountering congestion at the school front door.

iii. Congestion around schools caused by the presence of many motor vehicles dropping children off result in vehicle-pedestrian conflicts that causes many parents concern for safety of children walking through that mix.

c. Fill in Gaps (incl. barriers, ramps, faults, etc.) – PW inventories sidewalk system for faults, ramps, gaps within a block, and other barriers. Access improvements are supported by a \$400,000 per year ¼ Cent CIP Sales Tax program.

- i.** Current priority is on upgrading sidewalks along “The Link” corridor and other identified needs scattered around town.
- ii.** Needs are identified by information from “Service Requests” called or e-mailed to City Public Information Office and from inventory done by staff. Include inventory and prioritization process in report.

d. Streets with Businesses (esp. retail) – The program to upgrade streetscapes in the downtown area was developed in response to Vision 20/20 objectives for downtown. Priorities are set by the downtown CID board. The program is funded by grants (primarily Federal Transportation Enhancement funds) and ¼ Cent CIP Sales Tax allocated to downtown projects. Most suburban-style arterial streets with business frontage are also bus routes which have a high priority for sidewalk construction. A project is currently scheduled for sidewalks on Campbell Avenue from Sunshine St. to Battlefield Rd. Sidewalks on Campbell Ave. south of Campbell would be constructed in the future with street improvement projects.

e. Bus Routes (and connections to bus routes) – CU Transit and PW maintain a list of needed sidewalk improvements on bus routes. Improvements (sidewalks, ramps, bus pads, benches, shelters, etc.) are funded by FTA New Freedom funds and 1/8 Cent Transportation Improvement Sales Tax funds. The Intermodal Connection program in the 1/8 Cent Transportation Improvement Sales Tax allocated \$250,000 per year to sidewalk improvements for bus routes, trail connections, and reduction of pedestrian/motor vehicle conflicts. There is a committee of CU, Springfield PW, MoDOT to review and address transit issues. This committee maintains a list of sidewalk needs and their priority.

f. Other

- i.** Private Property – PW and Planning have identified the need to provide pedestrian access between the public way and buildings on private property and are currently researching ways to accomplish this. The report will highlight this need.

1. Building code requires pedestrian access within buildings and from between handicap parking spaces and building apertures. Subdivision code requires sidewalks on streets. There is no code that requires pedestrian access on properties between buildings and streets. Staff is considering a code amendment for pedestrian access between buildings and streets, understanding resistance of property developers and managers and length of time required to negotiate suitable language.
 2. Discussion of need for a compliance officer to review and enforce pedestrian access compliance.
 3. Discussion that the City should not pay for changes on private property for pedestrian access.
 4. Discussion of need for education of and discussion with designers for what makes most sense.
 5. Center for Independent Living encourages use of “universal design” which strives to provide reasonable access for multiple modes, but is not same as ADA compliance.
 6. Consider extent of requirement for additions and renovations vs. new construction and rebuilding.
 7. Consider incentives such as tax credits and parking reduction to offset cost of pedestrian facilities.
 8. Currently only access from street is at a driveway where the pavement must be shared with motor vehicles
 9. Site is not accessible unless one can go all the way from street to door.
- ii. Arterial Crossing Opportunities – The report will highlight the need to consider all users and appropriate distances between pedestrian crossings. Controlled crossing opportunities are a long way apart on major arterial streets because design has been to move vehicles efficiently at cost to pedestrian convenience and safety.
 - iii. Pedestrian Signals and Detection – Countdown pedestrian signals and pushbuttons that are accessible and audible are the current intersection design standard. The report will highlight the current standard and the need to set a priority program for upgrading all signalized intersections to meet the standard.
 - iv. Pedestrian signal timing – Walk and Don’t Walk intervals are timed per MUTCD standards for a walking speed of 3.5 feet per second and guidelines for locations used by slower walkers to time for walking speeds of less than 3.5 feet per second. Statistics were quoted that 3.5 feet per second is faster than a high percentage of people walk and a slower speed should be used.
 - v. Automatic Walk Signal – Report will suggest when an automatic walk signal is appropriate. For most suburban-type locations, automatic walk signal will result in longer cycle lengths and long red intervals on major streets that would not be accepted well by most motorists. Improving accessibility to pushbuttons is a better alternative for most major street intersections.
 - vi. Sidewalk continuity – The report will highlight the need for sidewalk continuity. As construction programs reduce number of mid-block gaps, signing can be considered to identify remaining gaps. Continuity would be a high priority between major transition points such as signalized intersections on major streets. Report will highlight need to sign for barriers or provide protection measures due to sidewalk

construction and activities adjacent to the sidewalk and need to complete sidewalk repairs in a timely manner.

1. Wheelchair users sometimes take the street in bike lane or motor vehicle lane when sidewalk is not available or continuous.
 2. Discussion of proper use of bike lanes including registered motor vehicles, scooters, wheel chairs, pedestrians, skate boarders, etc.
 3. Consider change in statutes that any driver of a vehicle shall yield to a pedestrian in the roadway. Vehicle drivers should respect pedestrians.
- vii. Education for drivers, walkers, and property owners
1. Driver responsibilities
 2. Pedestrian responsibilities
 3. Property owner responsibility - Keeping accessible path on sidewalks (without parked cars, overhanging vegetation, garbage cans, cracks and faults, snow and ice, sprinklers, sidewalk café areas, etc.)
 4. Designers for new and reconstructed building sites
- viii. Pedestrian walkway connections – Find opportunities for connections among neighborhood streets and major streets where street connections are not available (connecting cul-de-sacs, parallel streets, etc.)
- ix. Operation and Maintenance
1. Snow and ice removal operations
 2. Sweeping
 3. Regulation of encroachments
 4. Inventory and repair program
- x. Benchmarking - Develop and maintain programs for benchmarking number of pedestrians using facilities
1. Pedestrians are counted at signalized intersections at approximately four-year intervals
 2. What is best way to determine pedestrian volume where counts are not now being made? Do we need more frequent counts at some locations?

III. Identify Streets that Should Be High Priority for Pedestrian Facility Improvement –

- a. Document in the plan how priorities are determined or recommend a process for determining priorities.
- b. Major Streets – Provide a continuous sidewalk path on one side as first priority, then sidewalks on both sides of Campbell Avenue, Battlefield Road, Sunshine Street, Kearney Street, Glenstone Avenue, Chestnut Expressway, etc.

IV. Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 10 from 3:30 to 5:00 at TMC. Tentative agenda is to review and approve meeting notes from February 21, the February 28 public meeting, and each of the three focus groups that met in March; review outline for plan; and, from the compilation of comments from the public meeting and focus groups, review the concept of the plan for person-powered mobility.

V. Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.